DETAILED ACTION

1.   This communication is responsive to Amendment , filed 10/2/2007.

2.   Claims 1-73 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 29, 43, 53, 63, 65, 71 and 73 are independent claims. This action is made Non-Final.

3.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   Claims 1-8, 11-12, 15, 23-53, 59-63, 65, 67-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rosen (US 6,938,218 B1).

As per claim 1, Rosen teaches an electronic information access system, comprising:

a concept map having a perimeter larger than a viewing window within which a portion of said concept map is viewable, said concept map and said viewing window are configured such that less than the entire concept map is visible at any given time (figs 5-6; col. 3, lines 45 et seq.; *only a subset of objects from all the possible objects are displayed*); and a navigation interface that allows a user to selectively position a desired portion of said concept map within said viewing window (fig 6; col. 3, lines 50-56; *user selectively navigates to a desired portion of the entire map of all related web objects through the displayed objects*) .

As per claims 2-4, Rosen teaches said navigation interface comprising at least eight-way, mouse-over, selection functionality, wherein said navigation interface comprising at least eight

individual buttons, each button is associated with a unique navigation direction, and wherein said navigation interface comprising at least eight unique areas within said viewing window, seach of said areas is associated with a unique navigation direction. (fig. 6; col. 3, lines 47-56; from the center object 1, there are at least eight ways/directions that a user may navigates through via eight individual selectable icons/buttons/areas such as objects 2, 3, 4, 5, 12, 13, 16 and 17).

As per claims 5, Rosen teaches said viewing window comprises substantially all of, or all of, an associated browser window, wherein said navigation interface is incorporated in a browser tool bar and, or, menu (*fig. 6 depicts the viewing window comprising substantially all of, or all of, an associated browser window, as well a*s the navigation interface being incorporated in a menu comprising of selectable objects such as 2-5).

As per claims 7-8, Rosen teaches a border around at least a portion of said concept map, wherein said border functions to indicate to a user that at least a portion of an edge of said concept map has been encountered (fig. 6; the border is shown to be the bounding lines/perimeter surrounding objects 10, 15, 20 and 25).

As per claims 11-12 and 15, Rosen teaches/suggests said concept map comprising at least one subject topic and, or, at least one sub-subject topic (fig. 6; col. 11, lines 51 et seq.; *levels of information and the objects are shown as at least partially configured as a graphic/image/text representation of an item selected from a commercial environment*).

As per claims 23-24, Rosen teaches said concept map to be configured to move with respect to said viewing window, wherein said viewing window is configured to move with respect to said concept map (col. 3, lines 45 et seq.).

As per claims 25-26 and 28, Rosen teaches said concept map to be selected from a group comprising a commercial environment covering at least one limitation as claimed, wherein said concept map is three dimensional (fig. 6; col. 11, lines 51 et seq.)

As per claim 27, Rosen teaches the electronic information access system to comprise at least a personal computer (*web browsers are inherently processed by a computer so that a display could be shown therefrom*).

Claim 29 is similar in scope to claim 1, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale. Rosen also disclose at least one GO TO button (col. 11, line 17; *BACK button*).

Claims 30-51 are similar in scope to claims 11-17, 23-25, 25-28 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 53-62 are similar in scope to claims 1, 37, 39, and 26-27 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 63, 65, 67-71 are similar in scope to claims 1, 15, 37, 39, 26-27, and 1 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale. Rosen further discloses the implementation of the method in a graphics/drawing environment (col. 10, lines 50 et seq.), mouse over navigation interface (*using a mouse pointer to navigate over the displayed objects*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   Claims 9-10, 13-14, 16-22, 54-58, 64 , 66 and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosen (US 6,938,218 B1).

As per claims 9-10, 13-14, 16-22, 54-58, 64, 66, Rosen does not expressly/explicitly disclose all limitations as recited.

However, all of these features are well known in the art, particularly in the web browsing windows environment. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine/include these features with Rosen's system in order to further provide normal and expected common functionalities as pertaining to the web browsing operations, as well as provide on-line commercial advertisement opportunities to merchants.

As per claim 72, Rosen discloses the use of such graphics rendering software such as VRLM (col. 10, lines 50 et seq.). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to implement Rosen's method using any kind of drawing environment depending on choice and preference.

As per claim 73, Rosen's teaching of an internet based application comprising a mouse over navigation interface that allows a user to selectively position a scene on a related display has been addressed in previous paragraphs. Rosen does not expressly disclose the application to be an electronic game. However, since Rosen's method could be used in numerous environments such as art, and commerce etc. (col. 10, lines 24 et seq.), it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to implement Rosen's method in any similar environment including electronic game.

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-66 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

Applicant argues mainly that Rosen does not teach/suggest according to the disclosed

invention: (a) an electronic information system comprising a concept map having a perimeter

lager than a viewing window which a portion of said concept map is viewable; (b) "GO TO",

"Return to Center", and "About" buttons; (c) a concept map based visual interface dynamically

linked to underlying electronic information, and configured to load quickly upon initiation by a

user.

The Examiner disagrees for the following reasons. While the Examiner gives weight to

the meaning of Applicants' choice of language as recited in the claims in light of Applicants'

disclosure in the specification, the Examiner is obligated to take into consideration that the

claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonable allow.

Per (a), the claim language requires only a "concept map", which is interpretable to be an

abstract map that comprises more information that can be displayed at any given time. Rosen

teaches such a "concept map", where only a portion of the total information could be viewed at a

time and the user could navigate through the information map as needed (abstract; figs 5-7).

Per (b), the use of these buttons which provide common navigation functionalities are

well known in the art . For example, Rosen discloses a GO TO button (col. 11, line 17; *BACK*

button).

Per (c), it is clear that the functions of "dynamically linked to underlying electronic information", and "configured to load quickly upon initiation by a user" (i.e. user initiates a navigation function e.g.) are necessarily inherent and must be performed in Rosen's method, so that the method/system could maintain organizing and tracking a user's navigating position within the "concept map".

Inquires

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sy Luu whose telephone number is **(571) 272-4064**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:300 am to 4:00 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley, can be reached on (571) 272-3923.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Sy D. Luu/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2174

SDL: 12/27/07